

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is in response to the Final Office Action of September 22, 2006. Per the conversation Applicants held with the Examiner on November 15, 2006, the independent claims have been amended to include the use of a graphical user interface with the system tray program. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-23 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Objection

Claim 22 was objected to because of informalities. The informalities have been corrected and are reflected in the Listing of the Claims.

Specification

The Examiner suggested updating the U.S. Application referenced on Page 1, Paragraph 1 of the specification. The U.S. Application serial number and the current status have been updated and are reflected in the Amendment to the Specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 7, 9, 16-19, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tsuria (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,242) in view of Anand et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0191793) and in view of Vu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,104). This rejection is traversed in light of the current amendment and the arguments contained herein.

Applicant believes that combination of Tsuria, Anand et al., and Vu et al do not teach all of the elements of the claimed invention. The Examiner relies on the

teaching of Tsuria where an IRD encoding signals for a digital VCR is compared to the hub and data storage device in Applicant's claimed invention. However, Tsuria is silent as to the claimed element, "an installed system tray program configured to allow on demand customization of hub features using a graphical interface." As cited by the Examiner the TECM key is interpreted as the system tray and Tsuria fails to disclose that the TECM key can be customized using a graphical interface. As Tsuria fails to disclose all aspects of Applicants' claimed invention and Anand and Vu fail to cure the deficiencies of Tsuria, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection to claims 1, 7, 9, 16-19, and 21.

Claims 1, 5-6, 10, 12 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuria (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,242), in view of Anand et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0191793), and in view of Veil et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,202). As argued above, the cited portions of the publications do not contain all of the elements of Applicant's claimed invention. Particularly, the cited publications fail to teach, "an installed system tray program configured to allow on demand customization of hub features using a graphical user interface." Because the combination of Tsuria, Anand et. al, and Veil et al. fails teach all elements of Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the objection and believes that claims 1, 5-6, 10, 12 and 23 are in a condition for allowance.

The remaining rejections are toward dependent claims 2-4, 13, 14, 15, 20 and 22 that are directly or indirectly dependent to independent claims 1, 10 and 16. The remaining rejections are based on the combined teachings of at least Tsuria and Anand et al. in addition to a variety of other publication. The cited portions of the additional publications fail to cure the deficiencies found in Tsuria, specifically the

failure to teach, "an installed system tray program configured to allow on demand customization of hub features using a graphical user interface". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejections as claims 2-4, 13, 14, 15, 20 and 22 are in a condition for allowance.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP201A). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Konrad K. Chan, Esq.
Reg. No. 57,857

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer No. 25920